



KANSAS AGITATOR

VOL. 3.

GARNETT, KANSAS, DECEMBER 22, 1892.

NO 31.

WASHBURN'S REPLY TO MACUNE.

An Open Letter in Defense of the National Committee of the People's Party.

BOSTON, MASS., DEC. 8, 1892.

To the Reform Press:

My attention has been called to the false and misleading statements of Dr. Macune in his manifesto from Memphis, Tenn., November 20, and in his open letter published in the National Economist, December 3.

While I regret its necessity, I feel it my duty to reply, in the plainest of terms, as they allude to me personally. The statement that the executive committee of the People's party had a suite of rooms as headquarters on the parlor floor of the Gayoso hotel, and that we arranged a slate, established a lobby, and controlled the action of delegates either at Indianapolis, St. Louis or Memphis, I brand as a malicious falsehood.

Our committee had no headquarters. Mr. Taubeneck's room was on the floor above; two were used officially as Alliance headquarters, one by a person unknown to myself, and I occupied the remaining room.

The newspapers of Memphis and citizens in general discussed daily the merits of the rival candidates; we as individuals exercised the same right.

Dr. Macune was not defeated through the influence of Mr. Taubeneck and myself, but because of his past record. The claim that two men could control the actions of the national leaders of the greatest industrial organization in the world is not only absurd, but is an insult to every delegate. Dr. Macune has appealed to every national convention of the Farmers' Alliance for vindication at their hands for something he was charged with having done. This had grown monotonous. The farmers were disgusted. They had whitewashed him for the last time, and were determined to unload their burden.

In the last election of officers, only tried and true men were chosen, and the demagogues who had planned to either rule or ruin the Alliance were shelved.

Dr. Macune's non-partisan (?) Democratic friends made as many slates and worked as openly for him as did the Alliance friends of President Loucks. He allowed his name to be placed in nomination with that of President Loucks, and did not withdraw from the Alliance until he discovered that he was defeated. Had he been elected, the Democratic press of the country were ready to announce it as a second great Democratic victory, and in this way try to stampede the People's party advocates back to its ranks. This was a broad, deep, well-planned scheme.

The argument used by Alliance men in favor of President Loucks was that the northwest had done its full duty in support of Alliance principles, that the South had been honored with the presidency from the beginning, and that it was only fair and just that the northwest should have it for at least one year. Especially so, when the opposition had presented such an unsuitable candidate as Dr. Macune, whose elevation to the presidency would have been a disgrace to this great organization.

Dr. Macune thinks that the People's party got a "black eye" at Memphis. He tried hard to accomplish this, but was ignominiously defeated much to his discomfiture, as every man elected was a pronounced Populist.

He now poses as an independent in politics and a martyr for the Alliance, and seeks to regain favor by attacking leaders of the People's party, and thus manufacture sentiment with the Democrats of the South.

Hall and McAllister are said to have been elected to congress by the Democratic party as a reward for attacking the Alliance. Macune is now making the most of his opportunity to secure a reward at the expense of the Alliance.

We have urged our friends to try to keep the Alliance a non-partisan organization, for as such it can do the People's party more good than otherwise, as it educates the masses in the great principles embodied in its "demands," and serves as a recruiting force for the party. The logical results are that Alliance men

must seek political affiliations in harmony with their views, or prove traitor to their own convictions and to the Alliance.

The People's party being the only one which advocates these principles should expect the support of the Alliance members individually, and until one of the dominant parties advocates these reforms; it is but just to support the party which HAS THE COURAGE TO DO IT.

Similar conditions arose in the relation of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union toward the Prohibition party, which embodied the principles of the union in its platform, and virtually forced the members of that body to support the Prohibition party.

This was the only logical outcome and was right and just. The battle had to be fought, however, but the W. C. T. U. was equal to the emergency and parted company with Mrs. Ellen Foster and her Republican friends, and resumed its stately course, just as the Alliance is doing.

One would infer from Dr. Macune's egotistical defense of himself that he made the Alliance what it is, while, in fact, the Alliance found him a country doctor in an obscure town in Texas, and made for him all he is, including his financial standing, but his penchant for intriguing soon aroused suspicion of the integrity of his motives and actions.

THE JUST CRITICISM OF DR. MACUNE and other disloyal leaders has often called forth apologies from true Alliance men. There are in the Alliance two classes, one favoring carrying its principles into political action, the other not. Our beloved Col. Polk represented the former. When at Indianapolis he said: "I will go wherever Alliance principles lead me."

Dr. Macune, his antagonist, and other Southern leaders, represent the latter class, and were bold Alliance men until it meant political warfare; then they abandoned the Alliance and withdrew. Great stress is laid by Dr. Macune and his friends on the fact that the Alliance is a non-partisan organization. This is the cry of the thief to divert attention while HE, THE GUILTY ONE, ESCAPES.

Never since the birth of the People's party has any member holding office in the Alliance used it to advance the interests of his own party. The only parties guilty of this are the "non-partisan" Democratic members of the Alliance, who used their positions to further the interests of the Democratic party and cried loudest "stop thief" while pointing frantically to the other fellows to shield themselves.

No reform paper has shown itself such a traitor to its constituency as the Economist, the official organ of the Farmers' Alliance, when it published and sent out documents in the interest of one party while it claimed to support another. Its disloyalty to the Alliance should forfeit its official organ ship.

Its editor's name might well be placed in the same category with that of BENEDICT ARNOLD.

I am glad that Dr. Macune published the alleged interview copied from the St. Louis Chronicle, together with his "Open Letter" and my own denial in the same paper.

Careful comparison will show that the line of thought running through the two articles are almost identical, especially that alluding to Hall, McAllister and the "The Sub-Treasury Plan." These stories must have emanated from one brain, and the "fine Italian hand" of Dr. Macune can be easily traced between the lines.

At the close of the St. Louis conference a Chronicle reporter called on Mr. Taubeneck and myself and asked us to suggest "measures which would benefit the people." Mr. Taubeneck talked finance, and I monopolies and nationalism. We took the precaution to have our statements written and read to us. We then signed them. This all occurred in the presence of Mr. W. S. Morgan. These were never published, but instead, two columns of falsehoods.

I now believe that the whole affair was a huge conspiracy conceived by Dr. Macune and others. The Democratic press and this reporter were valuable aids in springing upon us one of the most damnable conspiracies ever conceived, intending to destroy Mr. Taubeneck and my-

[Concluded on last page.]